

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 40

NOVEMBER 5, 1962



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The Reprieve and What Needs to Be Done With It

Last week was the world's first thermonuclear crisis. It will not be the last. This issue of the *Weekly* might never have been written. You who read it might have been one of the lucky few, huddled half-mad with anxiety about missing loved ones, in the ruins of New York or Washington. Mr. Kennedy's gamble paid off. But what if it had failed? Unless we can achieve a fundamental change of behavior among nations, the Cuban confrontation is only a pre-view. Is the fate of the world again to be decided in a test of will and nerve between two men? Or among three? As the news slowly begins to trickle out from behind the secrecy imposed, we get a glimpse of close contact between Russian submarines and U.S. warships hunting them. A U-2 was shot down. Other U.S. planes were fired upon. Incident and accident thrive on such tension. What if one of them had led to an outbreak of fighting? What if on some lonely aerial or naval patrol next time, someone's nerve or judgment fails?

What If Castro Seized Those Missiles?

In an article written before the Cuban crisis but published just after it in the London *New Statesman* (Oct. 26), under the title "Can Nuclear War Be Prevented?", Bertrand Russell wrote it was essential "to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to powers which do not at present possess them" because "increase in the number of nuclear powers augments the danger of nuclear war at a rate greater than the increase in the number of nuclear weapons." Cuba demonstrated this vividly. In this, the first thermonuclear crisis, we saw the debut of the first Nth power. Though Khrushchev assured us, as we have so often assured him, that the ballistic missiles passed out to an ally were kept in close control of officers from Big Brother, what if Castro refuses to give them up? We are reminded by an Assistant Secretary of State (Martin, in a Voice of America broadcast) that Castro still has preponderant power in the island itself. He could seize the missiles and the Russians in charge of them. He could, with fewer than the 30 nuclear missiles he is supposed to have, blackmail the U.S. and the world. This is what Khrushchev risked. I would feel more grateful for his backdown if he hadn't made this terrible gamble to start with.

What happens when a bigger Nth power than Cuba is in a position to threaten the world's end to get its way? *Time* (Nov. 2) reported Bonn's Defense Minister Franz Josef Strauss "worriedly saw a cynical deal trading off bases between the U. S. and Russia, which would weaken his own long-range goal to obtain nuclear missiles for West Germany." (Our italics). What happens when last year's models of atomic weapons are available on the world's armaments market? What if Israel and Egypt had atomic weapons in the Suez crisis? If India and China had them now? If Chiang could

No Hurry

Since a nuclear test ban is one of the subjects on which fresh talks are now hoped for, we call attention to an unnoticed AEC-Defense Dept. release on Oct. 20. This said these two agencies had finally agreed on the site for an underground nuclear shot to be called Project Shoal. Inadvertently the release also reveals how effective these two agencies have been in dragging their heels on work to improve underground test detection.

Project Vela, to develop better detection methods, was launched May 7, 1960. One of the arguments for resumption of testing was the need for nuclear shots in this research program. When resumption of testing was announced by Mr. Kennedy Sept. 5, 1961, one of the purposes was to be the search for improved detection methods "for possible use in an international control system." Since then 55 announced and an undisclosed number of secret underground tests have been held but (as the release now reveals) "No nuclear detonation has yet been authorized specifically for the seismic research program."

The release says "much information bearing on improvement of capabilities" was gathered as a byproduct of these other tests. But Project Shoal will be the first test specifically for seismic research. It was first announced in November, 1961. Now, a year later, "site acceptance means that drilling and other work can go forward toward a possible detonation in the late spring or summer of 1963." This is certainly a sedate pace.

The release says "The site was chosen because it is in an area with a history of frequent natural earthquakes. (Sand Springs Range area of Nevada), so the seismic record of an underground nuclear detonation can be compared with that from a natural earth shock of approximately the same magnitude." We asked the AEC press office whether the purpose was to set off the test at a time when there was an earth tremor. This would try out another of Teller's bugaboos—the possibility of evading detection by holding tests during an earthquake. The AEC press office, after checking, assured the *Weekly* this was not the case.

lob one at Peking? This is what The Reprieve gives us time, precious time, to prevent.

National sovereignty has now become the right of any nation to decree everybody else's extermination. Either we end it or it will end us. Major Raul Castro, Fidel's brother, said in a speech at Santiago (Reuters in *New York Times*, Oct. 30) that "a worldwide holocaust was risked because President Kennedy has 'set himself up as supreme judge of the planet.'" There was justice in the gibe. He had arrogated to himself the right to decide when to press the button. The Pope appealed for negotiation. U Thant asked for a standstill. Lord Russell appealed to both sides. Mr. Kennedy insisted on a backdown by Khrushchev first. Fortunately, he

(Continued on Page Two)

(Continued from Page One)

got his way. But the happy relief should not blind us to the monstrous situation in which all humanity found itself. Any ruler, with nuclear weapons, as the head and symbol of a sovereign state, now has a Divine Right beyond that any King ever dreamed of, to condemn mankind to hell. Before the back-downs began, Kennedy, Castro and Khrushchev were all making like Joves, with their thunderbolts. As for the rest of us, ours was but to do and die, like the Light Brigade but not so glamorously, huddled in the cellar with canned goods and candles. The nation-state system that enables one or two men to decide life or death for the planet is the common enemy, not Russians or Americans, Communists or capitalists. The rest is delusion. "It is in the nature of political bodies," Jung wrote in *The Undiscovered Self*, "always to see the evil in the opposite group." Only this bigger and truly human perspective can light the way to peace.

JFK Warns About Toughness

We Americans emerge from the crisis the strongest power on earth. Man's fate depends on whether our collective intelligence can be made to match our strength. Mr. Kennedy, vastly strengthened politically by his victory, stands at a fork in the road. One way, the easy way, the line of least resistance, leads in the direction of a bigger arms and civil defense buildup so that next time we can be in an even stronger position to dictate terms. The military bureaucracy is already demanding heavier arms appropriations; the scare will lead to a strong demand for more and better stocked cellars in which to huddle. The President, however, according to a remarkable interview with James Reston (*N. Y. Times*, Oct. 29), "is rejecting the conclusion of the traditional 'hard-liners' that the way to deal with Moscow everywhere in the world is to be 'tough' as in Cuba." It is good to know that the President sees that the world cannot be governed by crisis and ultimatum.

Will Mr. Kennedy, then, take the other fork in the road? This requires courage and leadership of a far more difficult kind. The crisis showed the curious limitations of Presidential leadership in our society. The President can easily take

With The Ink Hardly Dry

"We on our part would agree . . . to give assurances against an invasion of Cuba."

—Pres. Kennedy to Chairman Khrushchev, Oct. 27.

"Authoritative sources warned today against any feeling that the agreement with the Soviet Union will lead to 'peaceful co-existence' with Fidel Castro's Cuba. . . . Once the first phase of actually dismantling and removing the Soviet weapons is completed, they said that the hemisphere and Cubans can get on with the more 'limited' phase of actually getting rid of the Castro regime. . . . At a 45-minute briefing in the State Dept. yesterday, Secretary of State Rusk told the 19 Latin American Ambassadors . . . not to exaggerate the extent of the U.S. guarantee against invading Cuba."

—Washington Star, Oct. 29.

"President Kennedy's assurance that the U.S. won't invade Cuba if Premier Khrushchev removes the Soviet missiles there does not mean this country has pledged away the possibility of invasion in other circumstances or at another time. This was the word today from high Administration officials in the face of some confusion over whether the U.S. guaranteed the Soviet Union it would never invade Cuba. These officials said . . . the U.S. is not committed to trying to deal with Castro in the future without the threat of invasion as part of its arsenal."

—Washington Daily News, Oct. 30.

the nation into war. He can only with difficulty lead it toward peace. When he seems ready to push the button, albeit for universal destruction, few voices are raised against him. But let him decide for peace and negotiation—and bipartisan ends. The Republicans and the right wing Democrats and a sizeable section of the bureaucracy are already complaining that we tied our hands on Castro. Their motto is better the whole world dead than Cuba red. The President is going to need the support of the peace forces, and he is going to have to help create a stronger peace movement, if we are honorably to live up to our assurances on Cuba in return for the removal of missile bases in the trying days ahead. A way out of the crisis can only be found if Mr. Kennedy now sets out to do what he has never done before—actively to educate and

U.S. Religious Leaders Beg Government and People to Use Reprieve Wisely

An emergency meeting of nearly 50 national church and synagogue leaders, both clergy and lay, was held in Washington Sunday, October 28, under the chairmanship of Dr. John Bennett, Dean of Union Theological Seminary, who issued the following statement:

"The world has been granted a reprieve from war. There is a grave decision before us. How shall we use this reprieve? Shall we exploit our strength, riding rough-shod over all the forces in the world which we dislike, or shall we use this occasion as a supreme opportunity for seeking and finding a new human basis for international security and peace? If we follow an immediate success by brandishing our might, we shall be deceived by our own strength. War in the nuclear age can bring no victory to any nation. Courage in a time of crisis should be matched by courage in a time of opportunity.

"We must admit our own share in the Cuban crisis. There are many possible factors in the decision of the Soviet Union to accept a course of accommodation in Cuba besides United States military strength. There is no assurance that a similar course will be followed by Soviet leaders in future crises. On the other hand, the American people must take account of changes in Soviet society which offer hope for

the future.

"The President of the United States is to be commended for the use which he has made of international instruments for the maintenance of peace—the United Nations and the Organization of American States. He has combined diplomatic initiative with commendable restraint and reasonableness under great provocation and popular pressure. He deserves full support for his readiness to explore fresh paths to peace.

"We address our fellow citizens out of our deep gratitude for the reprieve which has been granted us. The Hebrew-Christian tradition warns a people against pride in its own strength and sustains a people who possess the will to peace and reconciliation.

"The President and his advisors will not fail the people of this nation if the people make plain their will to reconciliation. As a free and powerful nation why should we fear a re-examination of every crucial international question? The UN is a providential instrument for the consideration of every threatening problem—Cuba, Berlin, bases, disarmament, nuclear testing. Such a re-examination will change our present opportunity into a creative avenue for the extension of justice, peace and freedom across the world."

to lead the American people to a saner view of the world, to a more sophisticated view, to a less self-righteous view. This may be his and our last chance.

The Really Hard Line

All this would require taking the really hard line—the line which runs athwart unthinking prejudice and hateful preconception. What are the lessons which need to be drawn from the crisis and driven home? One is the indispensability of the United Nations—it offered a face saving way for Khrushchev and Kennedy to back off from a direct blockade confrontation, a way to deal with Castro without offending his dignity and Cuba's. U Thant's efforts would have been impossible unless the United Nations had preserved sufficient universality and independence to remain a moral force. To maintain this universality and independence should be the aim of a wise American foreign policy; this dictates the admission of China and an end of the attitude which has treated the UN as if it were a U.S. errand boy. A second lesson of the crisis is that it followed inexorably from our unwillingness to co-exist with Cuba in the hemisphere. The stationing of Russian nuclear missiles in the island, the crisis which brought all of us so close to destruction, was the climax of the hateful attitudes and policies with which we have long sought to dominate, to destroy and to starve out an island neighbor in violation of the UN Charter and the Inter-American treaties. Until we face up to the truth about our own guilt toward Cuba, we cannot find our way safely and finally back from the brink.

The third and main lesson is that human beings everywhere must band together to get rid of this monster, The Bomb. We need to act now to prevent its spread; a denuclearized Latin America, Africa and Middle East is still easy to achieve; a denuclearized Pacific has been asked by Communist China on several occasions. A disengaged and denuclearized Europe between U.S. and U.S.S.R. is the one way to prevent future

Dog in the (Guantanamo) Manger

"And, of course, Cuban pressure for U.S. withdrawal from Guantanamo Bay has been mounting for months. Ironically, the Navy would probably have been willing to give up Guantanamo at the start of the Castro era; it's basically a convenient, warm-water training base for newly outfitted ships and is no longer vital for guarding the Panama Canal. Now such a pullout might be interpreted as a surrender and so is considered undesirable."

—"U.S. Bases Abroad, New Red Push Foreseen To Get Them Scrapped; Some No Longer Vital." *Wall Street Journal*, Oct. 29.

crises that would dwarf Cuba and from which extrication would be much more difficult. A noteworthy survey by Jonathan Spivak in the *Wall Street Journal* (Oct. 29) revealed the dwindling importance of our nuclear bases abroad not only in places like Turkey but even in England. "Indeed, U.S. military strategists," he reported, "would not [by a curious misprint we verified the "not" had disappeared in the edition we saw] be seriously perturbed if no new nuclear striking force were stationed on the British isles. The independent British deterrent is considered far more important as a morale booster for Britain than as strategic protection for the U.S." Such facts need to be brought home to the widest possible audience if we are to find the road to peace. Both Khrushchev and Kennedy in their final exchanges showed themselves sobered by their look into the abyss, ready for a fresh start. The urgent place for them to begin is with this wholly irrational war between India and China. If it is allowed to continue, the two big nuclear powers may slowly find themselves drawn in. A senseless quarrel which began over a few square miles of desolate Himalayan wasteland could end by engulfing the planet.

WILPF On "Reprieve Sunday" Calls for Talks on Disengagement Elsewhere

"The one thing which emerges most clearly from the crisis of the last week, during which the world has teetered on the edge of thermo-nuclear destruction, is the absolute necessity for negotiation rather than violence. That the world has not been destroyed by the sharp confrontation between the U.S. and USSR once again demonstrates the essential role which the UN and its dedicated Secretariat plays in the struggle for survival.

"WILPF notes with deep regret that by responding to the Soviet challenge of the establishment of offensive missile bases in Cuba with the imposition of a quarantine, our Government violated its treaty commitments under the Charters of the OAS and of the United Nations. We strongly believe that scrupulous compliance with international law and treaty obligations is an indispensable prerequisite to the maintenance of world peace. A situation having been created in Cuba which our Government felt threatened its vital security interests, it should have exhausted every possibility of peaceful settlement through negotiation and by bringing the matter before the UN rather than resorting to unilateral action calculated to bring the world to the brink of destruction.

"The immediate goal sought by our Government in this instance may possibly be achieved by the policy adopted. But the long term goal of the world's peoples to live in a world free from nuclear war is jeopardized by a policy dependent upon one side yielding to the threats of the other. With each side believing that the other if rational must give way rather than resort to thermonuclear war, the path is

open for the fatal collision when neither yields.

"The WILPF takes encouragement from the fact that both the US and the USSR have shown some measure of restraint in the current crisis. That the U.S. has, to this date, stopped short of invasion and/or bombing of the Cuban bases represents a victory for the forces of moderation within the Government over those who would return to that shameful period of U.S. history when sending in the Marines was the typical response to any hemispheric crisis. That Chairman Khrushchev first ordered his ships not to run the blockade, then directed their return to Russia and finally offered to dismantle the missile bases has demonstrated both restraint and a willingness to make substantial concessions in the interest of peaceful settlement of the present dispute.

"We welcome the announced willingness of both the U.S. and USSR to negotiate their differences under UN auspices, and their apparent recognition that the Cuban crisis, if resolved, can result in general negotiations leading to a detente between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries. We believe that the opportunity here presented to negotiate a mutually advantageous military disengagement and territorial disarmament not only in Cuba but also in Turkey and elsewhere, could be of tremendous significance in reversing the present arms spiral and in bringing about the general and complete disarmament to which both countries have committed themselves in principle though not yet in practice."

—Women's Int'l League for Peace and Freedom, Oct. 28.

Arms Control Asked to "De-Missilize" All Latin America, Africa and Middle East

Nobel Prize-Winners Propose Neutral Cuba and Non-Military Guantanamo

"Two general approaches for resolution of the Cuban impasse suggest themselves, varying in breadth of application and in the central concern to be dealt with.

"Dealing with the Soviets on a world-wide basis, the United States might refocus attention on measures that have already been topics for disarmament talks: preventing surprise attack and the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Dealing with these missiles as problems of surprise attack and proliferation would avoid some of the political liabilities of dealing with them in terms of the unacceptable Soviet demand for 'the elimination of all foreign bases.' Under these rubrics could be proposed the joint Soviet and American removal of all land-based medium and intermediate range ballistic missiles which are a threat to the two great nuclear powers.

Give Turkey More Aid As Part of Base Removal

"Such a joint removal would eliminate all missiles that would be clearly useful only for a first strike, thus making surprise attack much less likely. Removal would also reduce the possibility that such missiles could fall into irresponsible hands, the danger that makes necessary preventing proliferation. It would require the elimination of the present Soviet missiles in Cuba, and of American missiles in Italy and Turkey that are generally agreed to be obsolete. Although the Turkish government might interpret the withdrawal of American IRBM's as a lessening of political support, adverse reactions ought to be meliorable by increasing American conventional forces in, or economic aid to Turkey.

"The second, more narrow approach might treat Cuba as a special situation, but with implications for the larger context of world arms control. For example, the entire island of Cuba might be set aside as a special experiment in the enforcement of general and complete disarmament. This would require the Republic of Cuba to eliminate all its weapons, 'offensive' and 'defensive', except those agreed upon for the maintenance of internal order. It would also require the United States to transform the naval base at Guantanamo, which in recent years has been mainly a recreation and refueling station without direct and critical military function, into a non-military center that would bring obvious political

The Men Who Made These Proposals

The proposals published on this page were released Sunday, Oct. 28 by eight Nobel prize-winners and 9 experts on foreign and defense policy but ignored by the press. It was developed on the basis of emergency discussions in which the Peace Research Institute in Washington brought together some government officials and these experts, but was issued as the views of the 17 men whose names are appended to it. It was completed before the news late Saturday evening Oct. 27 suddenly indicated that the worst was over but their suggestions for a way out of the crisis are as applicable as they were before. We thought our readers would like to see their conclusions.

The eight Nobel prize-winners signing were Owen Chamberlain (Physics), Peter J. W. Debye (Chemistry), Donald A. Glaser (Physics), Arthur Kornberg (Medicine and Physiology), Fritz A. Lipman (Medicine and Physiology), Hermann J. Muller (Medicine and Physiology), Edward Mills Purcell (Physics) and Harold C. Urey (Chemistry). The nine experts were: James J. Wadsworth, David Riesman, Walter Millis, Kenneth Boulding, Charles Osgood, Gerard Piel (Scientific American), Donald N. Michael and Arthur I. Waskow. The last two are members of Peace Research Institute.

benefits to the United States. American vessels and forces now in Guantanamo could be based in other places in the Caribbean. A UN inspection and enforcement body would be necessary to guarantee the continued disarmament of the island and to inspect surrounding bases and waters in order to calm Cuban fears of armed attack from outside.

"The broad approach centered on missiles peripheral to the United States and the Soviet Union, and the narrow approach centered on Cuba, could conceivably be synthesized in some such approach as arms control extending over all of Latin America, Africa, and all the Middle East. Denuclearization of such a broad area would be extremely difficult to enforce without a large inspection force, but de-missile-izing the same area could be enforced without great difficulty, because missiles capable of delivering nuclear warheads are rather easy to detect with inspection on a moderate scale."

Free Copies This Or Any Other Issue Sent Free If You Send Stamped Self-Addressed LONG Envelopes

**I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.**

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name

Street

City **Zone** **State**

11/5/62

Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name

Street

City **Zone** **State**

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

**5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.**

NEWSPAPER

Second class

postage paid

at

Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except during August and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U. S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.